

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Toda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,650,307 B1; hereinafter "Toda"). Claims 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toda. Applicant submits the arguments below in traversal of the claim rejections.

Rejection of Claims 1-16 under § 112, first paragraph

Applicant submits that claims 1-16 comply with § 112, first paragraph.

Rejection of Claims 1, 11 and 13 under § 102(e) by Toda

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is believed to be patentable because Toda fails to disclose each and every element of the claim. For example, claim 1 recites:

A plasma display apparatus with low power consumption and high speed response comprising:

a plasma display panel driven by a discharge sustain voltage in the form of pulses;

an analog-digital converter digitizing an image signal and producing a digitized image signal;

a plasma display panel drive unit converting the digitized image signal into scanning pulses and data pulses for driving the plasma display panel and outputting the scanning and data pulses to the plasma display panel;

a power supply unit supplying the discharge sustain voltage to the plasma display panel drive unit; and

a controlling unit adjusting an output gain of the analog-digital converter in response to a variation of the discharge sustain voltage of the power supply unit.

(Emphasis added). For example, Toda fails to disclose a controlling unit adjusting an output gain of the analog-digital converter in response to a variation of the discharge sustain voltage of the power supply unit. Rather, Toda merely discloses the calculation of the power consumption P (col. 6, lines 3-11) and the determination as to whether the power consumption P is above or below the limit value PM of the power consumption (col. 6, lines 15-65). Therefore, Toda does not adjust any sort of gain value based on a variation of a discharge sustain voltage.

Also, claim 1 is patentable because Toda fails to disclose the claimed controlling unit as claimed. In the Office Action, the Examiner cites an A/D converter in the description of the

background art as allegedly corresponding to the claimed analog-digital converter. See col. 1, lines 45-51. Although the Examiner cites the drive controller 22, power control circuit 23, and a portion of the power source 5 as corresponding to the claimed controlling unit, none of the aforementioned components adjust any sort of an output gain in the A/D converter cited in Toda. See col. 6, lines 1-11.

In effect, the Examiner essentially combines a description of the background art with an embodiment of Toda to reject claim 1 over § 102. Applicant submits that such mixing and matching of components from different embodiments is impermissible because “[t]he elements must be arranged as required by the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131. The teachings of different embodiments in a single reference may not be combined absent a suggestion to do so. In re Kramer, 18 USPQ2d 1415, 1416 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is believed to be patentable for at least the above reasons.

As for the rejection of claim 11, Applicant submits that claim 11 is patentable because Toda fails to disclose or suggest, inter alia, adjusting an output gain of the digitized image signal in response to a variation of the discharge sustain voltage, as recited in the claim.

Claim 13, which depends from claim 11, is patentable for at least the reasons submitted for claim 13.

Rejection of Claims 14-16 under § 103(a) over Toda

Claims 14-16, which depend from claim 1 or 11, are patentable for at least the reasons submitted for their respective base claims and because the Examiner has not shown how the deficiencies of Toda with respect to claims 1 and 11 are obvious in view of the prior art.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide prior art which teaches or suggests the recitations of claims 14-16. Applicant requests the Examiner to provide prior art and the necessary motivation which would suggest the modification of the teachings of Toda to include a scaler or a decoder unit, which the Examiner characterizes as being well-known and expected in the art.

Lastly, Applicant points out that claims 2-10 and 12 are presumed to be patentable because the Examiner has not rejected these claims over the cited prior art. If the Examiner rejects claims 2-10 and 12 as being unpatentable over prior art in the next Office Action, Applicant points out that the next Office Action should be issued on a non-Final basis.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 10/694,842

ATTY DOCKET NO.: Q77421

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Seok-Won Stuart Lee
Limited Recognition No. L0212

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 31, 2006